REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed September 5, 2007, claims 1-18 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3-11, 13, and 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jordan et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,745,113 ("Jordan"). Claims 2 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jordan in view of Kram et al. U.S. Patent No. 4,754,326 ("Kram"). Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jordan in view of Carroll U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0098670 ("Carroll"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. All amendments are fully supported by the application as originally filed and do not add new matter. Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration in light of the following remarks.

The § 102(b) Rejection of Claims 1, 3-11, 13, and 15-18

According to the MPEP, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference" (MPEP 2131). Jordan fails to teach each and every element of the independent claims.

Amended Independent Claim 1 Patently Distinguishes Over Jordan

Amended independent claim 1 recites a method for displaying Semantic Web statements having start properties and stop properties related to lifetimes of the Semantic web statements such that a Semantic Web resource is queried, and Resource Development Framework (RDF) statements matching the query are received. Jordan fails to describe this subject matter.

In particular, Jordan fails to describe displaying Semantic Web statements, querying a Semantic Web resource, and receiving RDF statements that match the query. The Action concedes that Jordan fails to teach or suggest use of Semantic Web resources, but asserts that because Jordan discloses a system that can operate on a network of computers, Jordan teaches a system that is

functionally equivalent to a Semantic Web (see, Office Action, page 13). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Semantic Web is a collection of software tools and content, which provides information on the Internet, or World Wide Web, in a way that can be readily processed and used by software agents and other computer programs. (see, e.g., Applicant's specification, paragraph 4). It is based on a set of internationally recognized standards for assigning semantic information to data available over the Internet and World Wide Web. Semantic Web resources can be Internet resources (e.g., Web sites or Web pages) or physical objects represented on Web pages. As a result of the claimed system's interoperability with the Semantic Web, its functionality can readily be adopted by third parties, thereby expanding the functionality of the Semantic Web standard.

Jordan, on the other hand, describes the use of a stand alone application (see, e.g., Jordan's specification, column 5, lines 23-37), thereby meaningfully limiting its portability. To widely expand the usefulness of the Jordan system to other systems, those systems would have to obtain the new application and implement a database to store the relevant information. This meaningful difference in the portability and expandability of the claimed subject matter in comparison to that described in Jordan demonstrates that the two are not equivalent.

Moreover, the claimed subject matter includes receipt and interaction with RDF statements. RDF statements, which are subject-predicate-object triples that refer to instances of specific classes, provide a general framework for describing Semantic Web resources (see, e.g., Applicant's specification, paragraphs 4-5). RDF statements can be represented as graphs to capture semantic meaning from the content of Semantic Web resources. Thus, when start properties and stop properties are associated with RDF statements, time-varying information about Semantic Web resources can be determined and displayed. Jordan fails to describe the use of RDF statements. Instead, Jordan's system provides for a graphical representation of objects and allows objects to be represented as database records (see, e.g., Jordan's specification, column 7, lines 35-43). Thus,

Jordan does not teach each and every limitation of amended independent claim 1, as is required for a rejection under § 102(b).

Applicant therefore requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of amended independent claim 1. Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and add further limitations thereto. Applicant therefore also requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejections of claims 2-7.

Amended Independent Claim 8 Patently Distinguishes Over Jordan

Amended independent claim 8 recites similar subject matter as claim 1. Specifically, amended claim 8 recites a system including a processor that receives an input from a user, where the input includes a query to retrieve RDF statements matching the query. In addition, amended claim 8 describes using an application program interface (API) to determine RDF statements from Semantic Web structured resources, and using the APIs to obtain start and stop properties.

The Action asserts that Jordan describes querying a Semantic Web resource to retrieve statements matching the query at column 8 line 15 to line 36. The cited passage states:

> The system allows database records to be accessed directly through a database editor 20c of menu commands, dialog boxes, and other conventional interface elements. Map objects and database records may be associated with each other by using the map editor to select objects and then link them to database records. A user may create, modify, and query the database records. Some fields and records contain information generated by graphical interface operations, such as the placement or moving of an object, and are created implicitly and normally hidden from the user in the database interface display. Database records associated with an object are accessible through database commands in the system menu or through a hypertext-like link that appears when a displayed object is opened. When the map editor 20a displays a map, the database information can be referenced by filters to control whether and how objects are displayed. (A filter is a program module, which may have a user interface, that provides a filtering function of selecting designated subsets of a set of data. A particular set of values or parameters for the filtering function may also be referred to as a filter, as will be clear from the context.)

This passage describes querying a database for records that match the query. Applicant respectfully submits that the database disclosed by Jordan is not a Semantic Web resource. Rather, the database is a stand alone application and is one way in which a user can edit information about workplace objects (see, e.g., Jordan's specification, column 8, lines 9-15). Therefore, when a user performs a query on the database, the output of the query is merely a workplace object, and not a RDF statement as disclosed in the claimed system. Using RDF statements provides a way for automated software agents to capture information from Semantic Web resources, which in turn enables users to visualize the information and interpret it with greater efficiency and certainty.

In addition, Jordan fails to describe using an application program interface (API) to determine RDF statements from Semantic Web structured resources, and using the APIs to obtain start and stop properties, as recited in independent claim 8. The Action asserts that this subject matter is described at column 11 line 31 to line 52. The cited passage states:

> Turning to FIG. 9 and FIG. 10, the project editor provides two kinds of editor windows: first, a task network window 90; and second, a task time line window 92. In the task network window 90, the system provides for a user to define and edit tasks and their properties using the same basic techniques that have already been described in the context of the map editor and relationship editor. Task objects begin with a set of predefined properties, which may be extended by a user. The predefined properties include start and stop dates (which may include times), resources required (such as people or equipment), and task dependencies (on which tasks, if any, does this one may depend). Through the resources and other properties, task objects may be linked to the objects of other tools, including map objects and relationship objects.
>
> In the task time line window 92, the system provides for a user to view the information presented in the task diagram in the form of a time line. Predefined time line formats include the simple task time line, which shows time along one axis and tasks placed in time along another axis; and the resource time line, which shows how resources are joined with tasks over time.

This passage describes using a task network editor to enable a user to edit objects and their predefined properties, which can include start and stop dates. However, this passage does not describe using APIs to determine RDF statements. In addition, this passage does not describe using

APIs to obtain start and stop properties associated with RDF statements. The task network editor is merely a graphics window that allow a user to edit various object features.

Applicant therefore requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of amended independent claim 8. Claim 9 depends from claim 8 and adds further limitations thereto. Applicant therefore requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of claim 9 as well.

Amended Independent Claim 10 Patently Distinguishes Over Jordan

Amended independent claim 10 recites similar subject matter as claim 1. Specifically, claim 10 recites a method for displaying time-varying information for RDF statements. As recited in the claim, statements from a Semantic Web resource are filtered based on a query and displayed such that, statements whose lifetimes fall outside a selected timeframe are hidden from the display. As set forth above, Jordan fails to describe displaying time-varying information for RDF statements. Furthermore, Jordan fails to describe filtering statements from a Semantic Web resource based on a query. Applicant therefore requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of amended independent claim 10.

Amended Independent Claim 11 Patently Distinguishes Over Jordan

Amended independent claim 11 recites a computer-readable medium including instructions for associating a lifetime with a Semantic Web structured statement. As recited in the claim, a start property which denotes a start time when the RDF statement becomes valid and a stop property which includes a stop time when the RDF statement ceases to be valid are implemented for the statement, and a time interval between the start time and the stop time denotes the lifetime associated with the RDF statement. As set forth above, Jordan does not describe the use of RDF statements.

Applicant therefore requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of amended independent claim 11. Claims 12-18 depend from claim 11 and add further limitations thereto.

Applicant therefore requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of these claims as well.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response other than as indicated in the enclosed Amendment Transmittal. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-1945, under Order No. BBNT-P01-261 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: February 5, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Chasan/

Michael J. Chasan
Registration No.: 54,026
ROPES & GRAY LLP
One International Place
Boston, Massachusetts 02110-2624
(617) 951-7000
(617) 951-7050 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant